



RECEIVED
MAY - 3 2003
PATENT
3430-0129PCC

IN THE U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: LEE, Gun-Hee et al. Conf. No.: 3862
Appl. No.: 09/33,782 Group: 2871
Filed: August 7, 2000 Examiner: Hoan C. Nguyen
For: LIQUID CRYSTAL DISPLAY DEVICE AND METHOD OF THE
SAME

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Honorable Commissioner of Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

May 6, 2003

Sir:

In response to the Examiner's Office Action dated February 6, 2003, the following remarks are respectfully submitted in connection with the above-identified application.

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the very thorough consideration given the present application.

Claims 1-18 are now present in this application. Claims 1 and 12 are independent.

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Examiner's Interview

The Applicants' representative conducted an interview with the Examiner on February 25, 2003. The Applicants express their appreciation to the Examiner for making time available to conduct the interview.

In the interview, the Applicants' representative asserted that the evidence of the advantages obtained by turning a TFT upside down are provided in the original specification on page 4, lines 10-18. Particularly, since both the first and the second substrates have first and second black matrices, respectively, the substrate-aligning process is complicated, leading to an increase in alignment error. That is to say, the addition of the second black matrix results in the addition of an inferiority factor to the substrate-aligning process. Further, the number of processes required for forming the second black matrix 56 at the second substrate is increased due to the addition of the additional black matrices 56. Hence, there is a need for a liquid crystal display device which is free from an affect of the dispersion reflection, has a high aperture ratio and a simplified substrate-aligning process (original specification on page 4, lines 10-18).

The position taken by the Applicants' representative was that one of ordinary skill in the art understands from the invention that these advantages will be achieved in the device as claimed by the Applicants. Therefore, neither

further evidence (beyond the disclosure itself), nor further claim amendments are necessary.

The Examiner agreed to give full consideration to the Applicants' arguments in this Request for Reconsideration. Further, the Applicants have provided arguments (below) directed to pointing out additional distinctions between Applicants' claimed invention and the references cited by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103 have been overcome.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,373,540B1 to Munakata in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,151,089A to Yang et al. (Yang). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In conjunction with the points discussed in the Examiner's interview and summarized hereinabove, Applicants assert it is well established that in order for the Examiner to make a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the combination of the prior art must teach all of the claim limitations.

In this instance, the primary reference (Munakata) discloses a film 20, asserted by the Examiner to be a passivation film. Film 20 covers a portion of gate insulating film 17, and also covers gate electrode 16 (FIGS. 2A-2D and

FIGS.3A-3J). The switching element 8 (TFT) of Munakata includes gate electrode 16, drain electrode 22, and source electrode 21. Each of the figures mentioned by the Examiner (FIGS. 2A-2D and FIGS.3A-3J), clearly show that the drain electrode 22 and source electrode 21 are not covered by film 20. Because these components (necessary parts of a TFT) are not covered by the film 20, it cannot be validly asserted that the switching device is covered. Accordingly, because this limitation is not taught by Munakata, it follows that all of the claim limitations are not taught by the combined references, and therefore the Munakata reference must be withdrawn.

Particularly, Munakata fails to disclose or suggest forming a passivation film over the whole surface of the first substrate while covering the source and drain electrodes, as recited in independent claim 1, or forming a passivation film over the whole surface of the first substrate while covering the source and drain electrodes, as recited in independent claim 12. Yang cannot fill this vacancy.

Claim 2 depends on claim 1. Since neither Munakata, nor Yang discloses or suggests the above-recited features of independent claims 1 and 12, Munakata, in view of Yang, cannot render claims 1-2 and 12 obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this art grounds of rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 3-8 and 13-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Munakata in view Yang as applied to claims 1, 2 and 12 above, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,847,781A to Ono et al. (Ono). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Munakata and Yang, argued above with respect to independent claims 1 and 12, fails to disclose or suggest forming a passivation film over the whole surface of the first substrate while covering the source and drain electrodes, as recited in independent claim 1, or forming a passivation film over the whole surface of the first substrate while covering the source and drain electrodes as recited in independent claim 12. Ono cannot fill this vacancy.

Claims 3-8 and 13-15 depend, either directly or indirectly on independent claims 1 and 12. Since neither Munakata, nor Yang, nor Ono discloses or suggests the above-recited features of independent claims 1 and 12, Munakata, in view of Yang, and further in view of Ono, cannot render claims 3-8 and 13-15 obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this art grounds of rejection are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that

the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone Percy L. Square, Registration No. 51,084, at (703) 205-8034, in the Washington, D.C. area.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By:



Joseph A. Kolasch

Reg. No.: 22,463

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

Telephone: (703) 205-8000

JW
JAK/PLS:asc:ndb

PATENT
3430-0129P

IN THE U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:	LEE, Gun-Hee et al.	Conf.:	3862
Appl. No.:	09/633,782	Group:	2871
Filed:	August 7, 2000	Examiner:	Hoan C. Nguyen
For:	LIQUID CRYSTAL DISPLAY DEVICE AND METHOD OF THE SAME		

LARGE ENTITY TRANSMITTAL FORM

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, DC 20231

May 6, 2003

Sir:

Transmitted herewith is a Request for Reconsideration in the above-identified application.

- ☐ The enclosed document is being transmitted via the Certificate of Mailing provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.8.
- ☐ The enclosed document is being transmitted via facsimile.

The fee has been calculated as shown below:

	CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER AMENDMENT		HIGHEST NUMBER PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR		PRESENT EXTRA	RATE	ADDITIONAL FEE
TOTAL	18	-	20	=	0	\$18	\$0.00
INDEPENDENT	2	-	3	=	0	\$84	\$0.00
<input type="checkbox"/> FIRST PRESENTATION OF A MULTIPLE DEPENDENT CLAIM						\$280	\$0.00
						TOTAL	\$0.00

Appl. No. 09/633,782

- ☐ Petition for () month(s) extension of time pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a). \$0.00 for the extension of time.
- ☒ No fee is required.
- ☐ Check(s) in the amount of \$0.00 is(are) enclosed.
- ☐ Please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2448 in the amount of \$0.00. This form is submitted in triplicate.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.


Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By


Joseph A. Kolasch, #22,463

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000


JAK/PLS/ndb
3430-0129P

ATTACHMENT

(Rev. 09/27/01)